Reporting Federal Activities and Matters of National Concern . . .

HIGHER EDUCATION

October 1963

Higher Education and the Federal Government

J. KENNETH LITTLE

Tuition and Fees Charged by Universities and Liberal Arts Colleges: 1962–1963

LOUIS A. D'AMICO and W. ROBERT BOKELMAN

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Office of Education

Contents

FEATURES

Page

Higher Education and the Federal Government, *J. Kenneth Little* 3
Tuition and Fees Charged by Universities and Liberal Arts Colleges: 1962–1963, *Louis A. D'Amico* and *W. Robert Bokelman* 7

OFFICE OF EDUCATION STUDIES AND SURVEYS

Higher Education Costs Continue to Rise 10
Fall Enrollment Estimates 10

OE PROGRAM NOTES

National Defense Education Act 11
Cuban Refugees Teach 13
American Education Week 1963 13
Project English 14

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Agency for International Development 14
Alliance for Progress 14
In the Office of Education 15

OTHER PROGRAM NOTES

National Science Foundation 15
Veterans Administration 16
Atomic Energy Commission 16
Public Health Service 17
Drop-out Study 18
Civil Rights 18
Status of Women 18
Agency for International Development 20

NEW PUBLICATIONS 24

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

HIGHER EDUCATION

Vol. XX, No. 2

Reporting Federal activities and matters of national concern in higher education

Published nine times a year. Printing approved, Bureau of the Budget, August 30, 1960.

Subscription: In advance, $1.25 a year (single copy, 20 cents), to foreign countries, $1.75. For orders of 100 copies or more in bulk to one address in the United States, 25 percent discount is allowed. Send remittance to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

Chester L. Neudling, *Chairman*

Henry S. Brunner — R. Orin Cornett

John H. Russel — K. W. Mildenberger

Diana C. Hirsch, *Editorial assistant*

ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare

FRANCIS KEPPEL

Commissioner of Education

R. ORIN CORNETT, *Acting*

Assistant Commissioner for Higher Education

Higher Education and the Federal Government

By J. KENNETH LITTLE*

THE NEW USES of the Federal dollar in activities in higher education are testing the Nation's sensibilities about the appropriate relationship of the Federal Government to higher education. Citizens who have assumed that any or all questions about this relationship are either academic or were settled long ago by tradition would open their eyes, perhaps even their mouths, if they were to read some of the reports and articles that have been written on the subject in the last few years.

As the author of one of these reports, I know the difficulties of assembling reliable information (and of interpreting it correctly) about either the Federal Government or higher education. Moreover, discussions about "the Federal Government" and "higher education" have a certain air of unreality. These are global terms. "Federal Government" breaks into many branches, departments, and agencies; and each establishes its own relationship with institutions of higher education and in large measure formulates its own policies and regulations. "Higher education" breaks into hundreds of colleges and universities, each cherishing its own independence and most granting a high degree of autonomy to its departments and faculty members. Neither the Federal Government nor institutions of higher education are organizations in the business sense; they are aggregations of individuals grouped together to accomplish manifold parts of private and public purpose.

These are circumstances which help to explain the crosscurrents of conflicting opinion I have noted among Federal officials, legislators, university administrators, faculty members, and citizens about many of the issues involved in determining the proper relationship between the Federal Government and institutions of higher education. These conflicts notwithstanding, the authors of 10 of the most recent major books on the subject show a surprising amount of agreement. Although they report on studies conducted under a variety of auspices and using different procedures, they reinforce each other in dominant tone, fact, interpretation, and recommendation. Taken together, these books make a strong case for an expansion of Federal interest in the strengthening of higher education and call for policies and measures both in higher education and in the Federal Government which will strengthen the partnership. For example, there appears to be consensus on these major points:

a) Federal support of higher education is an historic fact. The issue is not whether but how this support should be given.

b) Current Federal programs are beneficial to institutions participating in them. The benefits outweigh the risks.

c) Institutions of higher education need a strong and diverse base of support of which the Federal Government should be a part, but only a supplemental one.

d) Programs of the Federal Government should be expanded to provide greater support to the parts of the educational program now receiving

*Dr. Little is professor of educational psychology at the University of Wisconsin. He has had wide experience in teaching, research, university administration and in State, regional, and Federal activities in higher education. In 1954–55 he was U.S. Deputy Commissioner of Education and in 1960–61 was director of the survey of Federal programs in higher education under title X of NDEA. Dr. Little was vice president (student affairs) of the University of Wisconsin from 1951–57, associate director of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation of the Big Ten Universities (plus University of Chicago) in 1958–59, and a member of the joint staff of the Coordinating Committee for Higher Education for Wisconsin in 1957–58.

little or no Federal aid—the humanities, for example.

e) Strong institutions of higher education have proved to be a vital national resource. The development of excellent colleges and universities is an important national goal, one in which the Federal Government has a legitimate interest.

What is more, most of the authors, whatever their plan or purpose, reveal a keen awareness of the problems and political issues inherent in the Government-education relationship. Over the years, as the connection between the activities of Federal agencies and the educational programs of the Nation's colleges and universities has grown closer and more complicated, not many persons have sensed the nature of the change or read meaning into it. Universities have not fully understood what was happening to them; and the Congress has lacked information about the total scope of federally sponsored programs in higher education, the accomplishments of these programs, and the effects they have had upon educational programs as a whole.

SOME of the authors explore the historic facts, searching in the past for an explanation of the complexities of the present and the possibly even greater complexities of the future. Certainly the historical evidence they offer suggests that there is strong public support for Federal activity in higher education.

Charles V. Kidd, in his *American Universities and Federal Research*,[1] concludes that both the Federal Government and the universities have been responding to societal forces of which they are only a part and that, in addition, both have had a tendency to seek bigness as an end in itself. To the first part of this conclusion Alice Rivlin, in *The Role of the Federal Government in Financing Higher Education*,[2] hardly takes exception. The present state of affairs, she says, was "not planned; it just grew." She points out how, all along the way, one Federal activity grew out of another: The GI bill brought larger numbers of students to college campuses, and the college housing loan programs followed; concern about scientific manpower led to fellowship programs which spread to fields of health, foreign languages, and other areas of education; growth in the volume of research and graduate training led to provision for research laboratories and facilities in which to carry on research; and the concentration of Federal activities in relatively few institutions led to programs which would develop more and new centers.

Homer D. Babbidge, Jr., and Robert M. Rosenzweig also express their views about the evolving relationships between the Federal Government and higher education. In *The Federal Interest in Higher Education*[3] they describe the political and educational forces which have been shaping these relationships, and identify and evaluate three issues—"obstacles, if you will"—to the maturing of these relationships: the issues of church and state, Federal control, and segregation. In a chapter devoted to these issues they say that the growth of the relationship between Government and higher education has been directed and shaped by what the Congress has found to be politically possible. Apropos the church-state question, they analyze the distinctions in the Congress between what Federal actions and activities are acceptable in institutions of higher education but inappropriate for elementary and secondary education. They describe the way in which the issue of "Federal control" cloaks a real and deeper concern about tax reduction or at least tax reform. And, on the segregation issue, they venture the opinion that "Congress does not want to have to treat the issue any more frequently or directly than is necessary." These three issues, they say, form obstacles which, until they are resolved, spell defeat of proposals for general aid to education.

Their discussion of political considerations in the Government's various decisions to establish programs in educational institutions reminds me that the degree of Federal activity now found in American colleges and universities might not have come about if the several programs had had to win acceptance under the name of "Federal aid" or in the name of "education." In the name of science, disease, defense, aid to war veterans, or aid to international education, however, major parts of education, public and private, have been made the

[1] Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1959. 272 pp. A foundation-financed study of the research missions of Federal agencies. Deals with the research goals and policies of the agencies, the basic functions of universities, the volume and distribution of Federal funds among fields of research, the manpower problem in the sciences and its relation to recruitment and subsidization of trainees, policies of reimbursing universities for costs of performing research, and conditions affecting freedom of inquiry.

[2] The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., 1960. 175 pp.

[3] McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, N.Y., 1962. 214 pp.

subjects of profound influence and profuse assistance.

Babbidge and Rosenzweig describe the numerous Federal programs, the numerous sponsoring agencies, and the numerous congressional committees in which Federal activities are considered. They cite the recommendations of a succession of Presidential advisory committees and commissions about the need for coordinating the policy and administration of the Federal effort, and say that "Congress has not yet come to grips with the greatly increased network of relationships that now characterizes Government-higher education affairs."

At least three other publications trace, in considerable detail, the origins and development of the currently wide-ranging Federal activities in higher education. One, *The Federal Government and Higher Education*,[4] edited by Douglas M. Knight, is a compilation of the papers that were required background reading for the participants in the Seventeenth American Assembly, Arden House, May 1960, and concludes with the statement of consensus reached by the participants on the issues in Federal aid to higher education. It is a thorough-going source of information about the complex and growing activities of the Federal Government in colleges and universities.

Another, *A Survey of Federal Programs in Higher Education*,[5] is a summary report of a survey which the U.S. Office of Education made under a provision of the National Defense Education Act of 1958—Title X, section 1001, (d)—and which I directed. The report puts together for the first time a description of the panorama of federally sponsored programs in higher education—those based on formal agreements between Federal agencies and universities.

Title X reflects congressional awareness of the need for "full information concerning all specialized scholarship, fellowship, or other educational programs administered by or under any such (Federal) department or agency" with a view to "developing policies and procedures which will strengthen the educational programs of the institutions utilized for such purposes by any such department or agency."

The report identifies five major types of programs—(1) research, (2) education and training, (3) student financial aids, (4) loans and grants for facilities and equipment, and (5) international programs—and points to two major patterns of relationships between the Federal Government and institutions of higher education: Federal-State relationships, exemplified in the land-grant college programs, and the Federal-institutional relationships, which have developed through contracts and grants, such as those under NDEA. The Office report, based on data derived from 1959 and 1960 Government reports and statistics, also draws on a survey reported last year by the Brookings Institution under a contract with the Office of Education; the report of this survey, entitled *The Effects of Federal Programs in Higher Education*,[6] by Harold Orlans, will be referred to again on these pages.

A third, *The Federal Government and Education*,[7] prepared under the direction of John F. Morse, is a report from the Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives. It covers much of the same ground as the Office of Education survey, but by updating the statistics to 1962 it documents the continuing rapid growth of Federal activity.

THE AGREEMENT among the studies that the Federal programs have, on the whole, been beneficial to the participants should surprise no one: the colleges and universities themselves, with few exceptions, agree. This is not to say, however, that the studies wholly agree on what the effects have been—either the beneficial or the potentially detrimental—or that they see the problems they identify as equally important. Perhaps the conclusion reached by the participating institutions in the Carnegie Foundation survey, as reported by Reuben H. Gross in *Higher Education and the Federal Government*[8] epitomizes the general opinion: that Federal aid has been "highly beneficial" despite some problems it has created.

---

[4] The American Assembly, Columbia University, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1960. 205 pp.

[5] J. Kenneth Little (Office of Education publication No. 50033), Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1963. 56 pp. The full report is in preparation.

[6] The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., 1962. 335 pp. Based on a study of 36 institutions, ranging from universities that are heavily involved in federally sponsored activities to undergraduate liberal arts colleges that have little participation in such programs.

[7] Prepared for and available from the Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., 1963. 176 pp.

[8] Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, New York, N.Y., 1963. In press. Based on self-studies in 26 colleges and universities similar to those used in the Brookings Institution study—in fact, a few are the same. They range from large, prestigious universities such as Harvard, Michigan, and Stanford to smaller less widely known undergraduate colleges such as Catawa, Union, and Lawrence.

The following summary statements cover the major points the studies make on the subject of effects:

Kidd holds "that large-scale Federal financing of research has set in motion irreversible forces that are affecting the nature of the universities, altering their capacity to teach, changing their financial status, modifying the character of parts of the Federal administrative structure, establishing new political relations, and changing the way research itself is organized." He finds, however, that on balance Federal funds have improved the quality of research and graduate training, strengthened research installations in universities, and have done so without endangering the freedoms of individual investigators. At the same time he says that the system of financing research is "imperfect and potential dangers exist" since the "Government has purposes which are not those of the universities."

Orlans also warns of the dangers to educational values that can arise in the growing connection between higher education and the Federal Government. In his study he sought lines of evidence on three main questions. Here, in summary, are his findings.

1. What have been the effects of Federal programs on the quality of instructional programs, particularly at the undergraduate level?

While the effects of Federal programs have, on the whole been decidedly beneficial, he says, Federal programs have served to concentrate the number of scientists at leading universities and thus tend to aggravate the difficulties of small colleges in securing science teachers. The strong impetus given to research "has accelerated the longstanding depreciation of undergraduate education at larger universities," and has widened a cleavage between the status and rewards of faculty in the sciences and humanities.

2. To what extent can or should fuller use be made of institutions not heavily involved in present Federal programs?

> . . . The present concentration of federal funds at certain universities coincides with the concentration of both faculty and student talent at these schools—so much so, that there is ground for concern at the excessive concentration of the ablest talent at a few institutions. Primary responsibility for broadening this distribution of scientific talent clearly rests with the U.S. Office of Education, the National Institutes of Health, and the National Science Foundation. Of the broad objectives which they should seek, the most important, we believe, is to strengthen our major state universities without impairing the strength of our great private universities.

3. What has been the experience of institutions with the administration of current Federal programs?

Large-scale Federal activity complicates the administration of institutions of higher education and relationships between faculty members and administrators; increasingly larger numbers of faculty members are being paid in part from Federal funds (which Orlans believes to be a mistake). There is insufficient flexibility in Government policies about reimbursing overhead costs of institutions that participate in their programs; there needs to be more and better information about federally sponsored programs; the principles of the project system of allocating Federal research programs are "sound and valuable", but the "broader departmental program, and institutional awards . . . are a welcome addition."

In his concluding chapter, Orlans expresses his fear that the acceptance of large-scale "Federal aid . . . reduces the institution's ability to say 'no' to the Government," and thus threatens its independence. He cites instances which give rise to his fears and points out examples of the kind of vigilance colleges and universities must keep and the independent action they must take.

The Office of Education study reports that federally sponsored activity is rapidly expanding the dimensions of university research and graduate education, widening the gap between strong and less strong institutions, and increasing the competition for qualified faculty members, particularly among strictly undergraduate colleges. College administrators participating in the study report that faculty members tend to identify more with the objectives of Federal agencies than with the objectives of the college; that there is difficulty in providing space, facilities, and time for Federal activities and in avoiding inequitable treatment of faculty members who do not participate in Federal programs.

THE 10 VOLUMES I have in mind as I write these pages contain a substantial number of recommendations for the future. Some of these recommendations are explicitly stated, some are implied, and some are made in the form of a criticism of the status quo.

Several of the publications specify a need for

(*Continued on p. 21*)

Tuition and Fees Charged by Universities and Liberal Arts Colleges: 1962-1963

By LOUIS A. D'AMICO and W. ROBERT BOKELMAN*

TUITION AND FEES, which make up a large part of the cost of going to college, vary widely in U.S. colleges and universities. The facts about tuition and fees are important to students and parents for a number of reasons: For the student who pays the charges out of his own pocket, they may determine his choice of a college and a profession; for the student who cannot pay his way, they may determine whether or not he goes to college. The facts on tuition and fees are important to others besides students and their parents—to members of State and Federal legislative bodies, directors of foundations that provide scholarship funds, and college officials who plan programs.

From data obtained in an Office of Education survey [1] we have computed the tuition and fee charges in 1962–63 to full-time students in undergraduate, graduate, and first professional programs in public and private universities, liberal arts colleges, and 4-year technical and other professional institutions.

The figures compiled show up some facts that are generally well known, others that are not:

- Charges were higher in private than in public institutions.
- Charges for students in graduate programs were lower than those for students in undergraduate programs in private universities and at the 10th, 25th, and 50th percentile points for resident students in public universities.
- In public liberal arts colleges charges to resident students in graduate programs were higher than those to nonresident undergraduates at the 75th and 90th percentile points and for nonresident graduate students, charges were higher than for undergraduates at each of 5 percentile points.
- Charges for professional programs varied widely. Generally rates were lowest in schools of agriculture and education and highest in medicine and dentistry.
- The average student in a public institution paid from one-fourth to one-half as much as the average student in a private institution. The average nonresident student in a public institution paid from three-fifths to five-sixths as much as the average student in a private institution.

Median charges for tuition and fees, 1962–63

Resident student in public colleges:
Teachers colleges, $208; technological schools, $259; other professional schools, $475; and junior colleges, $113.

Nonresident student in public colleges:
Teachers colleges, $408; technological schools, $506; other professional schools, $706; and junior colleges, $334.

Student in private institutions:
Teachers colleges, $575; technological schools, $1,050; theological schools, $361; other professional schools, $794; and junior colleges, $502.

—From *Basic Student Charges, 1962–63,* OE Circular 711.

Public Institutions

In 1962–63 charges for undergraduate and graduate students (resident and nonresident) were, with one exception, higher in public universities than in public liberal arts colleges: At the undergraduate level median charges for resident students were 60 percent higher and for nonresident students, 37 percent higher; at the graduate level charges were 53 percent higher for resident and 21 percent higher for nonresident. In universities the median charges to resident undergraduates were 6 percent higher and for resident graduates 2 percent higher than comparable medians in liberal arts colleges (see table 1). Median charges to nonresident undergraduates were 8 percent higher than those to graduates in universities; in liberal arts colleges

*Specialist for Business Administration, and Chief, Business Administration Section, Division of Higher Education, Office of Education.

[1] The survey is reported in *Basic Student Charges, 1962–63* (Circular No. 711) by Louis A. D'Amico and W. Robert Bokelman (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education).

median charges were about 5 percent lower to undergraduates than to graduates.

The tuition and required fees charged full-time students in first professional degree programs in public institutions showed much variation. For both resident and nonresident students, charges were lowest in agricultural programs and highest in medicine and dentistry. With the exception of medicine and dentistry, the median charges to nonresident students in professional programs were from 2 to 2½ times those of residents. In schools of medicine and dentistry, the median charges to nonresident students were approximately two-thirds higher than the median charges to resident students.

Table 1.—Tuition and required fees charged full-time resident and nonresident students in undergraduate, graduate, and first-professional-degree programs in selected public higher education institutions; aggregate United States, 1962–63

Type of institution or school	Number reported	Charges to students at these percentile points—				
		10th	25th	50th	75th	90th
Resident undergraduates						
University	92	$165	$207	$268	$315	$399
Liberal arts	83	76	96	168	229	324
Nonresident (out-of-State) undergraduates						
University	88	455	512	609	730	830
Liberal arts	78	285	385	444	518	663
Resident graduate students						
University	86	161	199	253	331	455
Liberal arts	41	64	83	165	296	395
Nonresident graduate students						
University	85	317	433	562	721	831
Liberal arts	41	363	415	464	555	716
Resident professional students						
Agriculture	59	128	174	223	286	336
Dentistry	22	360	513	550	711	750
Education	105	125	180	236	300	388
Engineering	80	155	204	250	318	400
Law	55	166	215	277	377	495
Medicine	36	380	442	563	675	750
Pharmacy	46	158	225	275	335	457
Nonresident professional students						
Agriculture	59	354	440	541	675	818
Dentistry	22	355	805	906	1,092	1,195
Education	105	355	459	563	678	796
Engineering	80	375	504	575	693	814
Law	55	428	512	607	803	881
Medicine	36	650	793	942	1,108	1,275
Pharmacy	46	423	504	580	693	807

Resident students in professional programs paid—

—from 20 percent lower (agriculture) to 110 percent higher (medicine) fees than resident undergraduates in universities; from 33 percent (agriculture) to 235 percent (medicine) higher fees than resident undergraduates in liberal arts colleges.

Nonresident students in professional programs paid—

—from 13 percent lower (agriculture) to 55 percent higher (medicine) fees than nonresident undergraduates in universities; from 22 percent (agriculture) to 122 percent (medicine) higher fees than nonresident undergraduates in liberal arts colleges.

Resident students in graduate programs paid—

—higher fees in universities than residents in three professional programs; lower fees in liberal arts colleges than resident students in any professional program.

Nonresident students in graduate programs paid—

—from 4 percent lower (agriculture) to 68 percent higher (medicine) fees than graduate nonresidents in universities; from 17 percent (agriculture) to 103 percent (medicine) higher fees than graduate nonresidents in liberal arts colleges.

Private Institutions

For both graduate and undergraduate programs the charge of private universities was higher at each of the 5 percentile points than the charge of private liberal arts colleges; the university median was 38 percent higher at the undergraduate level and 9 percent higher at the graduate level (see table 2). It should be pointed out here that at least 50 percent of the universities and 10 percent of the liberal arts colleges, or at least 100 institutions, had charges of over $1,000 at the undergraduate level;

Table 2.—Tuition and required fees charged full-time students in undergraduate, graduate, and first-professional-degree programs in selected private higher education institutions; aggregate United States, 1962–63

Type of institution or school	Number reported	Charges to students at these percentile points—				
		10th	25th	50th	75th	90th
	Undergraduates					
University	55	$663	$798	$1,038	$1,412	$1,556
Liberal arts	637	439	616	751	981	1,281
	Graduate students					
University	49	595	754	930	1,258	1,502
Liberal arts	89	518	693	855	1,048	1,303
	Professional school students					
Dentistry	23	810	925	1,088	1,325	1,452
Education	161	423	555	708	875	1,184
Engineering	64	588	743	963	1,225	1,520
Law	68	520	670	818	1,043	1,305
Medicine	34	1,040	1,175	1,288	1,470	1,540
Pharmacy	19	545	688	850	1,025	1,170

at the graduate level, at least 33 percent of the reporting institutions had charges of over $1,000. In the universities the median charge at the undergraduate level was approximately 12 percent higher than it was at the graduate level; in liberal arts colleges, the median charge at the graduate level was about 14 percent higher than at the undergraduate level.

Median charges in professional programs ranged from $708 in education to $1,288 in medicine. In both medicine and dentistry the median charges were over $1,000. With the exception of education, all private professional programs had charges of over $1,000 at the 75th percentile and all charged well over $1,000 at the 90th percentile. For professional programs charges were lowest for education (except at the 90th percentile) and highest for medicine.

Students at private professional schools paid—

—higher fees in dentistry (5 percent) and medicine (24 percent) than undergraduates in private universities but lower fees in education (47 percent), engineering (8 percent), law, and pharmacy;

—higher fees than undergraduates at private liberal arts colleges in all fields except education;

—higher fees than graduate students at private universities in dentistry, engineering, and medicine (38 percent) but lower fees in education (31 percent), law, and pharmacy.

—higher fees than graduate students at private liberal arts colleges in dentistry, engineering, and medicine (33 percent); lower fees in education (21 percent), law, and pharmacy.

Public vs. Private

As would be expected, the greatest variations show up in comparisons of public and private schools. Percentage differences computed from the medians in tables 1 and 2 are shown below:

- The average undergraduate in private universities paid almost four times more in fees and tuition than the average resident undergraduate and over 1½ times more than the nonresident undergraduate in public universities.
- The average undergraduate in private liberal arts colleges paid 4½ times more than the average resident and 59 percent more than the average nonresident in public liberal arts colleges.

- The average graduate student in private universities paid 3.7 times as large a fee as the average resident graduate student and a two-thirds larger fee than the average nonresident graduate student in public universities.
- The average graduate student in a private liberal arts program paid more than five times as much as the average resident graduate student in a public liberal arts college and two times more than a nonresident graduate student.
- Median charges in private professional schools ranged from 98 percent higher in dentistry to 285 percent higher in medicine than the median charge to resident students in public professional schools and from 20 percent (dentistry) to 67 percent (engineering) higher than the median charges to nonresident students in public professional schools.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION *Studies* AND *Surveys*

Higher Education Costs Continue To Rise

EXPENDITURES for higher education will continue to grow, according to a preliminary report of financial statistics of institutions of higher education based on a sample of 392 institutions. The estimated current-fund expenditures of higher education institutions during fiscal year 1962 were $7.1 billion, approximately 26 percent more than during fiscal year 1960. Estimated current income was almost $7.4 billion, or 27 percent more than in fiscal year 1960. Privately controlled institutions expended 44 percent of the total current-fund expenditures—the same percentage as in 1959–60.

Expenditures for organized research continued to increase. The increase was 30 percent over 1959–60. Expenditures for organized research now account for approximately 19 percent of the current-fund expenditures for both publicly and privately controlled institutions.

Additional information may be found in the summary report prepared by the Higher Education Surveys Section, Division of Educational Statistics. A limited number of free copies of the report, titled *Preliminary Report of Financial Statistics of Institutions of Higher Education, 1961–62, Based on a Sample of Institutions* (OE–52008), are available from the Office of Education.

Fall Enrollment Estimates

THE Office of Education has estimated that the 1963 fall enrollment in the Nation's public and private schools and colleges will increase for the 19th consecutive year to an alltime high of 51.5 million. This will be an increase of 3.4 percent over the 49.8 million enrollment figure estimated in the fall of 1962.

Higher education degree-credit enrollment is estimated to be 4.4 million, compared with 4.2 million in 1962. This estimate includes 2.7 million in public and 1.7 million in private institutions, as against an estimated 2.6 million in public and 1.6 million in private institutions in fall 1962. The estimated number of college and university teachers available to meet this enrollment is 345,000. The figure estimated for 1962 was 334,000.

Other statistics recently made available are as follows:

- Almost 58 percent of the population aged 5 to 34 were enrolled in some type of school last fall. Fifteen years previously, the figure was 42.3 percent.
- An estimated 64 percent of all students entering the fifth grade in 1954–55 graduated on schedule in 1961–62. Twelve years previously the percentage was only 50.5 percent.
- Expenditures for higher education, including plant-fund expenditures, are estimated at $5.1 billion for public and $3.9 billion for private colleges and universities.
- Total grants by all Federal departments supporting education in educational institutions, excluding payments for services rendered to the Federal Government, are estimated at $2 billion in fiscal year 1963 and at $1.7 billion in fiscal year 1962. Both figures include expenditures for certain basic research programs, for education for dependents of military personnel overseas, veterans education, and training grants. Office of Education programs in this category include school assistance in federally affected areas, manpower training, and the programs of the National Defense Education Act.

OE program notes

National Defense Education Act

Fifth-year anniversary

The National Defense Education Act was signed into law on September 2, 1958, a little over 5 years ago. Since that time, some $800 million has been paid out under the act to strengthen American education at all levels and to augment the Nation's supply of highly trained manpower, particularly in fields directly related to national security.

The act authorizes Federal assistance for student loans, graduate fellowships, technical education, for the expansion of guidance, counseling, and testing of students, for the strengthening of education in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, for the improvement of communications media for educational purposes, and for the strengthening of educational statistical services.

Enacted originally for a 4-year period, the NDEA was extended by the Congress last year for an additional 2 years. As the programs go into their sixth year of operation, these achievements can be reported:

1) *Student loans*

About 490,000 students in 1,534 colleges and universities have borrowed approximately $330 million under the student loan program. Seventy percent of the loans were made to students with superior academic background who intend to teach in elementary or secondary schools and to those with superior ability or preparation in science, mathematics, or a modern foreign language.

The program has stimulated non-Federal loan activity; approximately 50 percent of the institutions participating in the program had never included long-term loans in their student financial aid programs prior to NDEA.

2) *Graduate fellowships*

Awards were made to 7,000 graduate students for study in 170 institutions of higher education. About one-half of the $80 million so far expended or obligated has gone to fellows for stipends and allowances; the remainder to participating graduate schools to help cover the costs of the programs in which these scholars are studying. The program encompasses all 50 States and the District of Columbia.

3) *Technical education*

Approximately 30,500 new technicians have completed training under the area vocational program of NDEA. This program is designed to help meet the demand for highly skilled manpower in electronics, drafting and design, instrumentation, industrial chemistry, and other technical fields.

The number of participating institutions has increased from 262 in 1959 to 630 in 1963. The Federal Government has contributed about $42.7 million for salaries and equipment. States and communities have overmatched Federal dollars by about 2 to 1.

4) *Guidance, counseling, and testing*

Federal grants totaling approximately $65 million for local guidance programs have helped raise the number of full-time school counselors from 12,000 in 1958 to 27,000 in 1963.

By the end of the 1963–64 academic year, more than 13,800 secondary school counselors and teachers preparing to be counselors will have attended 416 special institutes to improve their capabilities in counseling and guidance at a cost of nearly $30 million. Approximately $65 million is available for guidance, counseling, and testing programs.

5) *Science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages*

During the 5-year period, about $181 million has been paid to the States and Territories on a 50–50 matching basis for strengthening instruction in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages in public elementary and high schools. In addition, loans totaling approximately $3 million have been made to private schools.

The number of language laboratories in public high schools has increased from 46 in 1958 to almost 6,000 at the end of the 1963 fiscal year.

6) *Language development*

Nearly 14,000 elementary and secondary school language teachers will have attended 301 modern foreign language institutes by the end of the 1963–64 academic year. The institutes have provided training for nearly one-fourth of the Nation's elementary and secondary school teachers of foreign languages.

Language and area centers.—During the first 5 years of the program, a total of 55 centers have been established at 34 colleges and universities. These centers offer instruction in some 70 languages which, until recently, had been rarely taught in the United States.

Some 2,000 students have received fellowships for the study of over 60 languages of critical importance. Obligations for this program total about $12.3 million over the 5 years, including $3.5 million for 1,035 awards for study in 1963–64.

Language research and studies.—Approximately $12.2 million have been obligated for 224 language research projects to determine the greatest needs in foreign language instruction, to study the best methods of foreign language teaching, and to develop specialized instructional materials such as textbooks, dictionaries, and recordings.

7) *Communications media*

Over $19 million has been obligated to support this program which investigates the most effective way of using communications media (television, radio, motion pictures, teaching machines, tape recordings) for educational purposes and disseminates this information to schools and colleges.

Awards have been made for 227 research projects to 114 institutions and agencies in 40 States and the District of Columbia. A total of 159 contracts have been made for disseminating information to 77 institutions, agencies, and individuals in 22 States and Territories and 2 foreign countries.

8) *Improvement of statistical services*

Forty-eight State education agencies received a total of $1,684,184 in 1963, bringing total expenditures for this program to $5,305,083.

Teach yourself French

A 1-year self-instructional course in beginning French will be tested during the 1963–64 academic year among regular students at the University of Akron, Akron, Ohio, and a group of working adults enrolled at its community college. The project is being conducted under contract with the Office of Education and will utilize tape-recorded materials developed by the University of Michigan under a previous (fiscal year 1963) OE contract.

Thirty college students will use the self-instructional materials for at least 10 hours a week in the language laboratory. In addition, they will be free to schedule informal sessions with instructors on pronunciation and other aspects of the usual modern foreign language course. Achievement tests will be administered periodically.

The 20 community college participants are to work independently with the self-instructional materials at home, using their own recorders. After completing a study unit, the student will report to the language laboratory to demonstrate progress and receive new material. There will be no formal classes. However, meetings with the instructor may be arranged by appointment. At times, the adult students will be given the tests administered to the regular college group.

A final technical report will be prepared by the university describing the project findings with emphasis on achievements and problems in the trial use of the materials.

Theodore Mueller, associate professor of French at the University of Akron, will direct the project. It is to cost $10,636 in funds authorized under title VI (language development) of the National Defense Education Act.

Conversational Chinese

A series of readings to strengthen the teaching of spoken Chinese is being prepared by the University of California at Berkeley under contract with the U.S. Office of Education. This project is expected to help meet a current and urgent need among students for natural conversation and connected discourse materials that reflect contemporary Chinese speech.

Project staff members will collect and edit materials on a wide range of subjects drawn from verbatim records of lectures, passages of free conversation, and items of folk literature. The completed materials will be presented as a group of readers, with the text in Chinese characters accompanied by transcriptions and necessary notes.

Yuen Ren Chao, Aggassiz professor of Oriental Languages and Literature, Emeritus, at the University of California, Berkeley, will be in charge of the project which is to cost $39,723 in funds authorized under title VI (language development) of the National Defense Education Act.

Examinations qualify language teachers

Proficiency examinations in foreign languages, developed by the Modern Language Association

under a grant from the Office of Education, are helping New York State acquire more qualified foreign language teachers in its public schools.

Examinations in French, Spanish, German, Russian, and Italian were recently given in Rochester and New York City to 127 persons born or educated abroad. Each person already had an American bachelor's degree or its foreign equivalent and either is or intends to become an American citizen.

Of the 127 applicants, 5 met all requirements and have been certified to teach, 36 satisfied all language requirements but must complete other requirements in professional education, practice teaching, or liberal arts, and 72 demonstrated the necessary language skills but were weak in the skills required to teach the language or did not have sufficient background in history and culture. The remaining 14 did not pass the skills part, had incomplete returns, or failed the examinations.

New Yorkers may secure information and application forms by writing to Foreign Language Tests, College Proficiency Examination Program, State Education Department, Albany, N.Y. Persons in other States who are interested in using the MLA Proficiency Tests for Teachers and Advanced Students should address their inquiries to the Modern Language Association, 4 Washington Place, New York, N.Y.

Foreign language study

The Office of Education is developing a 10-year modern language study and survey program to evaluate progress in language learning since the National Defense Education Act was passed in 1958. Five conferences have been held, attended by representatives from the Office and the Modern Language Association. Two studies have been approved for the coming year—one on enrollment in language courses, the other on a pretest of the use of transcripts of high school graduates.

Cuban refugees teach

Thirty-four Cuban refugees are teaching in Florida public schools this fall after completing a course at the University of Miami which qualified them to teach in the United States. An Office of Education grant of $22,000 to the university financed the course. Citizenship requirements for the Cubans were waived. Of the 34 teachers, 27 are teaching Spanish in junior high school, 6 are teaching in a bilingual school—Coral Park elementary school—and 1 is teaching first grade.

Other universities have expressed interest in the course for Cubans and have started programs of their own. The State University of Iowa started one last summer and Indiana University and Indiana State College started programs this fall. The University of Miami started its second class this September.

American Education Week 1963

"Education Strengthens the Nation"

Sunday, Nov. 10 Values of Free Men	Wednesday, Nov. 13 Balanced Curriculum
Monday, Nov. 11 Learning Opportunities for All	Thursday, Nov. 14 Community Resources
Tuesday, Nov. 12 Quality Teaching	Friday, Nov. 15 Financial Support

Saturday, Nov. 16
Goals for Tomorrow

Traditionally, the American public has thought of American Education Week as focusing primary attention on the elementary and secondary schools. However, with the growth in college enrollments, the increasing use of the advanced placement program by colleges and universities, and the need for education excellence on all levels, the program has come to have relevance for the higher education community as well.

American Education Week, November 10–16, 1963, provides a special opportunity for colleges and universities to share in the effort to direct public attention to the importance of education and at the same time focus that attention to some degree upon higher education in particular.

Among the topics for discussion, those for Tuesday, November 12 (Quality Teaching), Wednesday, November 13 (Balanced Curriculum) and Saturday, November 16 (Goals for Tomorrow) are particularly suited to programs conducted in cooperation with local and State school officials, or for application directly to higher education.

American Education Week is sponsored jointly by the National Education Association, the American Legion, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, and the U.S. Office of Education. The Office of Education and the National Congress of Parents and Teachers became sponsors in 1922 and 1938.

Project English

Seminar on English held

A seminar on English in contemporary education was held at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, Mich., August 7–9. The seminar was attended by about 40 nationally prominent educators and specialists in the field of English. Donald R. Tuttle, specialist for college English, represented the Office of Education.

Topics discussed included the status and purpose of English in contemporary society and its relation to the humanities, general education, and new methods for training teachers of English for secondary schools and colleges.

The seminar, sponsored by the Office of Education, was planned by the English departments at the University of Michigan and the University of Iowa.

English as a foreign language

Teachers College, Columbia University, has been awarded a $195,595 USOE cooperative research contract to prepare a set of materials to teach English as a second language to children of early elementary school age. Materials will be developed in cooperation with specialists in linguistics, reading, anthropology, the psychology of learning, and in teaching English as a second language.

The department of English and foreign languages at Teachers College and the Council for Public Schools are cosponsors of the project which is being financed by the Office of Education. Project director is Gerald Dykstra, professor of linguistics and Spanish at Teachers College.

International Education

Agency for International Development

University of Tunis to be expanded

Tunisia has been awarded a $1.8 million development loan from the Agency for International Development to build and equip classroom and library facilities for the School of Law, Economics and Business Administration at the University of Tunis.

Tunisia, in its 10-year plan, is placing heavy emphasis on education. The plan calls for compulsory elementary education for all children by 1967 and the creation of the national university at Tunis. The AID loan will be used in building one of the university's seven faculties.

The proposed 4-year curriculum at the School of Law, Economics and Business Administration will offer instruction in both French and English using both the traditional French lecture system and the case study technique pioneered in the United States.

Reference books in science and technology

The Agency for International Development and the National Academy of Sciences have joined with U.S. publishers in a pilot effort to assist developing nations in obtaining basic reference materials in science and technology.

The program calls for distributing, at a fraction of list prices, U.S. scientific and technical books to accredited institutions and qualified individuals in selected developing countries. AID funds initially available will permit distribution of approximately 4,000 volumes to each of 8 participating countries or areas over an 18-month period.

Alliance for Progress

Brazil expands agricultural education

A $903,000 Alliance for Progress grant to the University of Rio Grande do Sul in Brazil from the Agency for International Development will further teaching, research, and extension programs in agriculture. With the aid of the grant, the university will develop a graduate program in agriculture and rural social sciences, leading to a degree similar to a master's degree in the United States; conduct economic research to guide State and Federal agencies in Brazil, cooperatives, and farmers in developing programs for the rapid development of agriculture; plan and develop a new 3,500-acre agricultural experimental farm to be used for education and research; increase the number of undergraduate students enrolling in agriculture by 100 to 200 from the present level of 376; and provide for training in the United States or outside Brazil for its agricultural professors and specialists.

AID plans to contract with a U.S. university to provide persons to give advice on the teaching and research programs, coordinate the extension program,

and analyze the needs for the development of technical literature. The Brazilian university will finance postgraduate courses, complete unfinished buildings or construct new ones, and pay all salary, travel, and per diem costs for its employees.

Economics in Colombia aided

The University of Minnesota will help establish the first graduate program in economics at the University of the Andes, Bogotá, Colombia, under an Alliance for Progress contract for $449,530. Four economists from the U.S. university will work at the Colombian university during the 3-year contract period. Additional professors will go to Bogotá for special conferences and seminars and Colombians will study at the Minnesota campus during the second year of the contract.

U.S. advisers will also assist in the development of a research program and counsel the university on strengthening the library's supply of economics publications. National and international conferences to stimulate research are planned.

In the Office of Education

▶ During fiscal year 1963 the Technical Assistance Branch, Bureau of International Education, worked out educational training programs for 223 persons from the Far East. The Branch expects to prepare programs for approximately 260 participants during fiscal year 1964.

Of the 84 applications processed for enrollment in the fall term 1963–64, 93.3 percent are for degree purposes. During fiscal year 1963, 51.3 percent of the programs were planned for practical trade skills and related subjects in specified trade areas.

▶ Two international education seminars were held this summer for participants in educational training programs conducted by the Technical Training Section, Technical Assistance Branch of the Bureau of International Education.

The first seminar, conducted by the University of Wisconsin, was held August 19–30 in Milwaukee, Wis., for 51 participants. The second, conducted by the Wayne State University, was held for 30 participants in Detroit, Mich., from August 19–30. Both of the seminars discussed comparative education and the relationship of education to socioeconomic development.

Other Program Notes

National Science Foundation

Two years after graduation

What are college graduates doing 2 years after their graduation—are they working? Studying? Have they made use of the subjects they studied in college? These and other questions have been surveyed in a study, recently published by the National Science Foundation, entitled "*Two Years After the College Degree—Work and Further Study Patterns.*"

Based on a 1960 survey of more than 41,000 of the 1958 graduates from about 1,200 degree-granting institutions, the study was prepared for NSF by the Bureau of Social Science Research of Washington, D.C. The survey covered recipients of about 32,000 bachelor's degrees, 7,000 master's degrees, and 2,000 professional degrees. Ph. D. recipients were not included in the study.

Highlights from the report include the following:

1) Of those who received their bachelor's degrees in June 1958, most were married, more than one-third had attended graduate or professional school, and about three-fourths were in the labor force by 1960.

2) Of the advanced degree candidates in 1960, close to 60 percent were studying for the master's degree, 12 percent for the doctorate, and about 10 percent each for the L.L.B. and M.D. Candidates for other advanced degrees—theology, dentistry, and veterinary medicine—made up the remaining 8 percent.

3) About 80 percent of all the employed graduates held jobs classified as "professional." The largest group—about one-fourth of the men and two-thirds of the women—were employed as teachers.

These and other highlights are contained in a summary of the report available at no charge from the Office of Public Information, National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C., 20550. The entire report (NSF–63–26) may be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington D.C., 20402, for $1.75.

Scientific equipment program

Proposals to praticipate in the National Science Foundation Undergraduate Instructional Scientific

Equipment Program must be submitted before January 15, 1964. Institutions are eligible if they offer undergraduate programs leading to a baccalaureate degree with a major in any of the natural sciences, engineering, and certain of the social sciences.

Information on applications may be obtained by writing to:

Undergraduate Instructional Scientific Equipment Program
National Science Foundation
1951 Constitution Avenue NW.
Washington, D.C. 20550

Conferences and seminars

The National Science Foundation sponsored a 3-week seminar on engineering education and a 2-week conference on aspects of chemistry this summer.

The seminar, held at Michigan State University, brought together representatives from 26 American colleges and universities, a representative from Queens College in England, 1 from the University of Waterloo in Canada, and others from NSF and industry. The seminar, which emphasized the systems approach to teaching engineering, was made possible by a $90,000 NSF grant to Michigan State for curriculum development in engineering.

The conference on colloid and macromolecular chemistry brought together 30 college and university teachers of quantitative analysis or physical chemistry at the University of Southern California. Participants came from 21 States and 3 foreign countries—Yugoslavia, Indonesia, and India. The purpose of the conference was to develop interest in these particular fields of chemistry as they relate to the undergraduate curriculum.

Veterans Administration

War orphans education program

Approximately 12,000—15,000 young men and women have enrolled in colleges and universities this fall under the War Orphans Education Program. Since the program was started in 1956, about 56,000 have entered training.

The education program is for the sons and daughters of veterans whose death resulted from disabilities or illness incurred in active service. The students may take vocational courses or enroll for a college degree. They must have completed courses or have studied in a regular high school to be eligible. They may receive as much as 36 months of schooling during which the Veterans Administration may pay an allowance of up to $110 a month.

Korean GI bill

The last full year of schooling for veterans taking education or training courses under the Korean GI bill began this September. Courses starting in September 1964 must end on January 31, 1965. (Korean veterans with service-connected disabilities are under a different program and have no deadline for training.)

Eligible veterans may choose their own type of training in any school or establishment approved by an appropriate State agency. They will receive an allowance each month from the Veterans Administration to meet part of their training and living expenses.

Application forms may be obtained from the nearest VA regional office.

Atomic Energy Commission

Students train at AEC laboratories

This past summer 547 college students in science and engineering worked on scientific projects in atomic energy at 9 Atomic Energy Commission laboratories. All nine of the laboratories are operated under contract for the AEC by educational and industrial organizations.

The purpose of the summer program is to give college students an opportunity to use their training to assist in practical problems encountered in nuclear laboratories.

Nuclear symposia in Vienna and Amsterdam

A total of 41 U.S. nuclear experts took part in 2 scientific symposia held in late August in Vienna and in early September in Amsterdam. They represented the U.S. Public Health Service, the Atomic Energy Commission, industry, and higher education and private research organizations. Several hundred scientists from countries throughout the world attended.

At the Vienna meeting on August 26–30, 14 of the U.S. scientists presented technical papers and 6 served as scientific observers in a symposium on radiological health and safety in the mining and milling of nuclear materials. The meeting was sponsored by the International Atomic Energy

Agency, the International Labour Office and the World Health Organization.

At the symposium held in Amsterdam on September 2–6, 14 U.S. scientists presented technical papers and 7 served as scientific observers on exponential and critical experiments. This meeting was sponsored by the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Public Health Service

Study of patent policies in higher education

The National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council (NAS–NRC) has published a report on the study it recently made of the patent policies, procedures, and practices at institutions of higher education. The report is a sequel to a 1952 study on the same subject.

The study was supported jointly by the National Institutes of Health through the National Institute of General Medical Sciences, the Office of Naval Research, and the Departments of Army and Air Force. Objectives of the study, which covered 349 institutions with definite research and patent policies, were: 1) to collect information on institutions' patent policies with regard to their procedures, administrative machinery, and experience in handling both sponsored and unsponsored research, new discoveries, inventions and patents resulting from such research; 2) to analyze the data obtained; and 3) to prepare an interpretive report on the findings. The study also presents an analysis of the impact of sponsored research—particularly Government-sponsored research—on educational programs of institutions of higher learning.

Copies of the 291-page report, entitled *University Patent Policies and Practices*, are available from the NAS–NRC, Washington, D.C., for $5.00.

Grants and fellowships

The Public Health Service awarded 615 research grants and 1,089 fellowships totaling $27,690,897 during the first month of fiscal year 1964. Of this total, $15,486,883 were allocated to support 1,144 new research grants, fellowships, and research career awards. The remaining $12,206,820 were for the continuation of 334 previously approved research grants and 227 fellowships.

The new research grants were made to 181 institutions in 42 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and 14 foreign countries. The fellowships were awarded to 177 U.S. scientists and 71 scientists from other countries for study at 248 institutions in 43 States, the District of Columbia, and 16 foreign countries.

Universities cooperate in bioclimatology training

Eleven Midwestern universities, through a $238,016 grant from the Public Health Service, are participating in a joint program for graduate training in bioclimatology. (Bioclimatology is that branch of science which studies the influence of weather on living organisms.)

The universities, which form the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) are: the University of Chicago, the University of Illinois, Indiana University, State University of Iowa, The University of Michigan, Michigan State University, the University of Minnesota, Northwestern University, The Ohio State University, Purdue University, and the University of Wisconsin. Graduate students will be able to study and utilize facilities at several of the cooperating institutions.

Grants aid research

The Public Health Service has recently made a number of grants to colleges, universities, and nonprofit organizations to aid research projects and research facilities. These grants and a short description of the projects are:

1. Grants totaling $24,275,490 to 54 private and nonprofit institutions in 20 States for the construction, renovation, and equipment of health research facilities. The funds are to be matched by the institutions.

Since its authorization by the Congress in 1956, the health research facilities program has made 1,105 awards totaling $254,173,300 to institutes in 49 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

2. A grant of $84,548 to the University of Michigan School of Dentistry in support of the first year of a 3-year research project to determine how dentists can improve their service to the public by using chairside assistants.

The assistants will work with dental students during their clinical training at the university so that researchers can determine their influence on clinical procedures, patients, and the teaching program. The project will also study the value

of academic training in teaching the dentist to use assistants effectively.

3. A 3-year grant of $238,016 to 11 midwestern universities to train persons in biometeorology (a new science which is concerned with the effects of weather on man, animals, and plants).

The universities, which are already participating in a cooperative organization called the Committee on Institutional Cooperation, are: University of Chicago, University of Illinois, Indiana University, Iowa State University, University of Michigan, Michigan State University, University of Minnesota, Northwestern University, Ohio State University, Purdue University, and the University of Wisconsin.

4. A grant of $56,168 to Loyola Unversity for the first year of a 5-year study of the strontium 90 content of children's deciduous teeth. Scientists believe that the strontium 90 content of baby teeth is an indicator of the fallout level of this radionuclide that has entered the life cycle during the prenatal period and that this study will be an indirect means of monitoring radioactivity in human bones.

Drop-out Study

The Social Security Administration of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has awarded a grant to the Institute of Urban Studies at Teachers College, Columbia University, to learn the extent of withdrawal from high school and its economic causes among youth in 150 of the largest cities in the United States.

Entitled "Educational Barriers to Economic Security," the study is being directed by Robert A. Dentler and Mary Ellen Warshauer. Professor Dentler stated that sociologists believe that the decision to drop out of school is not determined by individual or psychological reasons but is the result of prevailing social and economic conditions in the community as a whole. His study will investigate this hypothesis.

Civil Rights

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, a temporary, independent, bipartisan agency established by the Congress in 1957, has published its third biennial report to the President and the Congress. This report consists of nine parts. The first five of these contain additional information in the subject areas that were covered in the 1961 report: voting, equal protection of the laws in public education, employment, housing, and the administration of justice. The sixth part reports on access to public by supported or provided health facilities and services. Part seven is devoted to a synthesis of the civil rights conditions that the Commission found in the course of its hearings in selected urban areas. The eighth part deals with the conditions under which Negroes serve in the armed forces. The final part reviews the activities of the Commission's 51 State advisory committees during the past 2 years.

The report is based on information gathered from many sources. Among them were: Urban area hearings in Phoenix, Ariz.; Memphis, Tenn.; Newark, N.J.; Indianapolis, Ind.; and Washington, D.C.; statistical surveys conducted in cooperation with other Federal agencies in addition to the Commission's independent surveys and field investigations; a fourth annual education conference on problems of school desegregation held in Washington, D.C.; and reports on local public education by experts from many sections of the Nation.

Entitled *Civil Rights '63*, the report is available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, for $1.00.

Status of Women

American Women, the report of the President's Commission on the Status of Women, was presented to President Kennedy on October 11, 1963 (see *Higher Education* for background information on the Commission, September 1963 issue). The ideas of more than 300 persons have gone into making the report. They included members of the Commission (see box), members of the committees, and persons who participated in four consultations held to consider women in private employment, women as portrayed by the mass media, contemporary functions of voluntary agencies, and special problems of Negro women. Selected highlights from the Commission's report follow:

On education, the Commission recommends—

- That highest priority be given to continuing education for all adult women, to improve their knowledge and to prepare them for new endeavors for the second half of their lives.
- That opportunities be made available to adults for education from the elementary school level through graduate college work. Education opportunities should be accessible, diversified, comprehensive, and

Members of the President's Commission on the Status of Women

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Chairman*

Dr. Richard A. Lester, Vice Chairman
Chairman, Department of Economics, Princeton University

Mrs. Esther Peterson, Executive Vice Chairman,
Assistant Secretary of Labor

The Attorney General
Honorable Robert F. Kennedy

The Secretary of Agriculture
Honorable Orville L. Freeman

The Secretary of Commerce
Honorable Luther H. Hodges

The Secretary of Labor
Honorable Arthur J. Goldberg[1]
Honorable W. Willard Wirtz

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare
Honorable Abraham A. Ribicoff[2]
Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze

The Chairman of the Civil Service Commission
Honorable John W. Macy, Jr.

Honorable George D. Aiken
U.S. Senate

Honorable Maurine B. Neuberger
U.S. Senate

Honorable Edith Green
U.S. House of Representatives

Honorable Jessica M. Weis*
U.S. House of Representatives

Mrs. Macon Boddy
Henrietta, Tex.

Dr. Mary I. Bunting
President, Radcliffe College

Mrs. Mary E. Callahan
Member, Executive Board, International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers

Dr. Henry David
President, New School for Social Research

Miss Dorothy Height
President, National Council of Negro Women, Inc.

Miss Margaret Hickey
Public Affairs Editor, ***Ladies' Home Journal***

Mrs. Viola H. Hymes
President, National Council of Jewish Women, Inc.

*Deceased.

Miss Margaret J. Mealey
Executive Director, National Council of Catholic Women

Mr. Norman Nicholson
Administrative Assistant, Kaiser Industries Corp., Oakland, Calif.

Mr. William F. Schnitzler
Secretary-Treasurer, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations

Miss Marguerite Rawalt
Assistant Director, Refund Litigation Division, Office of Chief Counsel, Internal Revenue Service

Dr. Caroline F. Ware
Vienna, Va.

Dr. Cynthia C. Wedel
Assistant General Secretary for Program, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

Chairmen of the Committees

Committee on Education
Dr. Mary I. Bunting
President, Radcliffe College

Committee on Government Contracts
Dr. Richard A. Lester
Chairman, Department of Economics, Princeton University

Committee on Social Insurance and Taxes
Honorable Maurine B. Neuberger
U.S. Senate

Committee on Protective Labor Legislation
Miss Margaret J. Mealey
Executive Director, National Council of Catholic Women

Committee on Federal Employment Policies and Practices
Miss Margaret Hickey
Public Affairs Editor, ***Ladies' Home Journal***

Committee on Home and Community
Dr. Cynthia C. Wedel
Assistant General Secretary for Programs, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

Committee on Political and Civil Rights
Honorable Edith Green
U.S. House of Representatives

[1] From December 14, 1961, to September 1962.
[2] From December 14, 1961, to July 12, 1962.

flexible. They should 1) meet the needs of the woman who can't read; 2) meet the needs of the college-trained woman working in new frontiers of arts or science; 3) retrain the woman who lost her job because of automation; 4) refurbish the skills of the woman who, after a full-time stint with home and children, wants to return to employment; 5) train mature women who wish to enter paid work.

- That responsible counseling both support continuing opportunities for education at whatever point formal school ended, and provide guidance to the 8 in 10 women who enter paid employment at some time during their lives.
- That colleges and universities make their admission requirements more flexible for mature women.
- That a Federal program survey, summarize, and

publicize research and information about women's education.

On home and community, the Commission recommends—

- That child care centers and after school and vacation activities be increased in every community for children of all kinds of families.
- That deductions from tax liability for working parents who pay for child care services be increased (maximum salary limitations in such deductions now available are unrealistic).
- That programs similar to the Department of Agriculture's Home Demonstration Service for rural areas be made available to all city dwellers.
- That, in planning for urban renewal and metropolitan growth, planning bodies consider social as well as economic and physical requirements and that they be alerted to the need for information centers for newcomers and minority groups.

On women in employment, the Commission recommends—

- That the Federal Government make imaginative and prudent use of part-time workers throughout its agencies.
- That an Executive order proclaiming the principles of equality of employment opportunity for women and advancing its application to work done under Federal contracts be issued.

On labor standards, the Commission recommends—

- That the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act be broadened to cover millions of low-paid workers, both men and women, who are still denied its wage, hour, and premium overtime pay protection.
- That women in executive, administrative, and professional jobs be exempted from hour law coverage.

On social insurance and taxes, the Commission recommends—

- That Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance and the Federal-State program for unemployment compensation be revised to correct deficiencies in provisions applicable to women; that benefits to a widow be the same as to her husband had he lived, and that the definition of dependents be broadened to include all reasonably close relatives dependent upon the single worker.
- That unemployment insurance benefits for men and women be based on the same standards.
- That unemployment compensation be made available to persons seeking work who are temporarily jobless because of a family move.
- That employers, unions, and governments consider means of providing maternity benefits in protection of workers against loss of income.

On civil and political rights, the Commission recommends—

- That the United States participate actively in international efforts to secure equal rights for women.
- That able and politically oriented women be considered for appointment to policymaking positions; and that women be encouraged to seek elective and appointive public office.
- That the States direct their attention to the increasingly recognized principle that "marriage is a partnership in which each spouse makes a different but equally important contribution", and that the civil capacity of married women and married men be equalized through State action by removing legal restrictions in the rights of married women to contract, convey or own real or personal property, to engage in business, to act as surety or fiduciary, to receive and control their own earnings and to dispose of their own property.
- That married women now be given the same rights as married men to choose their domicile for purposes such as voting, holding public office, jury service, taxation, and probate.

Individual copies of the report, *American Women*, are available from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, for $1.25 each. A discount of 25 percent is allowed for orders of 100 or more.

Agency for International Development

Task force on AID-university relationships

A task force on the Agency for International Development and university relationships has been organized by John W. Gardner, president of Carnegie Corporation, at the request of David E. Bell, Administrator of AID. The new task force, whose 21 members come from Government, education, and philanthropy, will conduct a study aimed at identifying the problems that impede the joint efforts of AID and U.S. colleges and universities. Mr. Gardner is chairman of the group.

The report will present suggestions for specific changes in present procedures and arrangements which would lead to improvements in performance abroad. The task force will investigate such problems as the amount of freedom for individual research given to professors under AID contracts, the reluctance of universities to release faculty members for long-term AID programs, and the loss of tenure and status for professors who do accept prolonged AID assignments.

It is hoped that the report will be completed by the end of 1963.

LITTLE—from p. 6

more coordination, not only among the institutions and within the Government, but between Government and the institutions.

The Office of Education study found, for example, that colleges and universities generally are convinced "that there is greater danger in weak policies and standards of participating institutions than in any dictatorial tendencies of Federal agencies and departments"; and the report recommends the establishment of a center within the Federal Government with responsibility for providing a continuous, general overview of its numerous programs.

Babbidge and Rosenzweig refer to what they consider the disarray of higher education in the United States, and lay the blame on lack of organization for unified and effective action toward common interests and goals. They do find strengths as well as weaknesses, however, in the present arrangements for common action. They also say that "minority-opinion spokesmen exercise an inordinate influence within educational organizations," and they chide educators who are not "content to describe their [educational] needs and the most effective manner of meeting them" but like to take on "the larger issue of whether it would constitute sound public policy to meet these needs."

"This self-imposed sense of corporate responsibility for expressing views on public policy," these two authors say, "has gotten in the way of effective expression of higher educational needs." But they commend the executive secretaries of educational councils and associations in higher education for clear and effective interpretation of the needs of higher education to Federal units of Government.

Fred Cagle, in his *Federal Research Projects and the Southern University*,[9] makes suggestions which he believes will be useful to universities, public or private, that are "not concerned about an excess of Government funds but disturbed about receiving so little." He is convinced that few universities know the full impact of federally sponsored research on their programs and operations and that Federal agencies are more or less unaware of the effects of their programs on the universities; and he recommends that effective organization be provided for an overall policy review of the interrelationships between Federal agencies and universities.

He advises universities to strengthen their policy-making machinery, to provide special research administrators when the level of extramural research exceeds 10 percent of the operating budget, to appoint a liaison officer between the university and Federal agencies to step up efforts to obtain research funds from non-Federal sources, and to become more effective participants in the legislative arena.

Cagle presents a long list of specific recommendations on many topics. Among the suggestions he makes to the Federal Government are these: Establish "clearer policies and procedures for the interaction of Government and universities"; find ways to strengthen a larger number of universities; provide institutional or block grants which will broaden the base of federally sponsored research; provide funds without matching requirements for the construction of research facilities; consider regional needs and establish regional programs of research; and provide more effective publicity about Federal agencies which sponsor research and about their policies and procedures.

Cagle is not the only writer to reflect concern about a limited base of federally supported research: the point comes up again and again in these reports. Kidd, for example, argues for "productive guidance" by consensus among competent people in choosing the areas of emphasis in research fields and programs. He considers desirable the diversity of Federal agencies which sponsor research, and he commends a policy in which the Federal Government does not

[9] Southern Regional Education Board, 130 Sixth Street NW., Atlanta, Ga. 1962. 97 pp. Based on studies of published information, extensive correspondence, and interviews with administrators of Federal programs, university faculty members, and others.

stipulate conditions for the acceptance of Federal funds which are designed to require institutions to "act in an approved manner or forbid them to act in a disapproved manner."

Daniel O. Price, in his *University Research Administration Policies*,[10] has compiled a set of policies for the administration of university research. They deal with internal administration, not with relationships between institutions and the Federal Government or other external agencies. The policies emphasize maintaining close relationship between research and graduate education, maintaining basic salary schedules (avoiding salary supplements for research), controlling outside employment of faculty members, coordinating research activities of professional school with research in the arts and science departments.

Several of the reports also call for an increased emphasis on the *quality* of all higher education. The institutions that participated in the Carnegie study, for example, ask whether it would not be wiser for the Government to recognize that "strengthening of higher education is itself a pressing national need," instead of considering such support as ancillary to other national urgencies or interests. The Office of Education report recommends developing more centers of outstanding strength and excellence among the Nation's colleges and universities, and greater investment in research upon educational processes. Kidd declares that "the preservation of a strong, diversified, free system of universities is as important a national goal as "the attainment of the operating objectives of Federal agencies"; he makes an appeal for "the national will to give first place to education at all levels and to the fostering of excellence in all fields. And Babbidge and Rosenzweig, after equating the Federal interest in higher education with a vaguely defined "national interest," state the case for the creation or identification of some agency in the executive branch of the Federal Government which can speak for *the people* and the public's stake in the welfare of higher education in the United States.

Rivlin, who says that the Congress already is "beginning to look on higher education as a matter for national concern and as a fit subject for Federal legislation in its own right," reaches conclusions about the improvements that should be made in the manner of Federal support of higher education. She says that the Federal Government should plan to increase its support, that this support should strengthen the basic instructional functions of colleges, that loans and grants for construction of academic facilities are appropriate, and that the support should continue to be for programs of special national importance, but for a wider range of programs. She opposes a massive Federal scholarship program as a means of channeling funds into the operating budgets of institutions, and prefers a program of lesser scope which would identify top scholars who have genuine need. She would continue current fellowship programs but cautions against considering fellowships adequate substitutes for making careers in those fields more attractive.

The recommendations in the report by the Committee on Education and Labor strike toward correcting imbalances resulting from the heavy emphasis on research in the natural sciences, and from heavy concentration of Federal funds in a small number of institutions; toward taking care of "areas of neglect"; and toward improving the Federal Government's legislative and executive machinery for considering and reviewing the educational programs sponsored by Federal departments and agencies.

IN MY OPINION the near unanimity of the studies on at least five major points has its roots in the fiscal problems of colleges and universities. It would be a mistake to assume that these expressions reflect common beliefs on the principle of general Federal aid to education or that everybody is happy about the way in which federally sponsored activities (and foundation-financed programs) play upon the objectives and programs of colleges and universities and upon the attitudes and activities of faculty members. Nor do these expressions fully reflect some of the misgivings of the colleges and universities that do not participate in Federal programs or participate in only a minor way. Public awareness of the facts is still dim, and public attitudes toward the issues are far from reaching such a point of consensus. But effective rebuttal of the facts and findings of these reports has not yet appeared. As a participant in The American Assembly (Arden House) and a number of its regional assemblies, I saw the varied coloration which the same facts and issues take on when they are viewed by prominent

[10] Southern Regional Education Board, 130 Sixth Street NW., Atlanta, Ga., 1962. 35 pp. Based on observations and interviews with colleagues in 13 institutions of higher education.

citizens in different regions—for example, citizens in Arizona, Colorado, and New Mexico did not think in the same way as citizens in Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi. The discussions were an effective venture in adult education, but the gap between the information citizens have and the information they need to develop political decisions still looms large.

It is a sign of the times that the leading proponents of Federal participation in the support of higher education include the Nation's outstanding nonpublic institutions, who are among the major beneficiaries of Federal contracts and grants, and are major contributors to the achievement of important national goals. The degree to which major private universities receive public funds and major public universities receive private gifts questions the usefulness of a real distinction between them on the basis of source of support. Possibly, the much discussed value of "diversity" is being replaced by distinctions based on degree of excellence. Certainly the issue of the appropriateness of using public funds in privately sponsored institutions, including church-related ones, has been bypassed. The use of the resources of strong private universities for nationally urgent purposes was so logical, so necessary, if you will, that it now forms a precedent for much Federal policy. The century-old programs of Federal-State partnership by which the Nation effectively promoted its agricultural development, which raised few questions of Federal control, and which avoided complications of the private-public or church-state issue seem either to have been forgotten or viewed as inappropriate in this era of science and technology. In my opinion, the influence of privately sponsored institutions upon existing Federal policies is more visible than the influence of State universities and and-grant colleges.

In a period when State governments are planning to coordinate their programs of higher education and are making regional agreements, it is strange that the idea of Federal-State coordination along lines of the land-grant idea has not received greater attention.

The fiscal problems of public colleges and universities are the outgrowth of fiscal policies of Government (tax structure and policy). There are few areas of major public interest in which local, State, and Federal funds are not pooled in the financing of projects. Education is no exception. Progress toward the solution of some of the problems may have to await reforms in the tax structure.

Without discounting the crucial problem of finding the financial means to maintain strong colleges and universities or the helpful supplemental role the Federal Government is playing, I would urge educators and the public alike to keep a steady eye upon the central purposes and objectives of their colleges and universities. Universities and colleges are changing in important ways under the impact of forces, Government and other, which are strong and pervasive. These studies report shifts in balance between research and teaching, between graduate and undergraduate education, and between scientific pursuits which are urgent and philosophical considerations which are indispensable. The motivations and aspirations of faculty members *are* changing. Students trained in research-oriented institutions are not ipso facto ready for the responsibilities as teachers of undergraduate college programs, nor do they seek such responsibilities or careers.

Change sometimes simply reflects growth, but not all forms of growth are healthy. The basic responsibility of educational institutions is education. Programs of specialized service, research or other, have their best justification when they support the educational function. There is need for continuing self-appraisal addressed not so much to influence Federal policy as to wisely shape and direct educational policy and purpose in a rapidly changing society.

In this connection, it seems pertinent to suggest that in the Nation's huge investment for research in manifold directions, the part which goes for research toward the improvement of educational arrangements and processes is strikingly small. Nor do recommendations in this direction frequently appear among the studies I have mentioned.

The fact, mentioned earlier, that neither the Government nor the institutions are easily identifiable entities explains in some measure the attitudes toward and the difficulties surrounding recommendations which would coordinate or centralize the activities of either the Government or the institutions. It is easy to oversimplify this whole situation, and in some respects the studies do not escape such oversimplification. Nevertheless they stand as important benchmarks in contributing to the understanding of a fascinating stage in the evolution of American higher education.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS, INC
313 N FIRST STREET
ANN ARBOR, MICH
HE-MAY

U
GOVERNME
DIVISION DOCUMENTS
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20402

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

If you do not desire to continue receiving this publication, please CHECK HERE □; tear off this label and return it to the address at the left. Your name will then be removed promptly from the appropriate mailing list.

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, $300 (GPO)

NEW PUBLICATIONS

Government Publications

How To Obtain

(*1*) *Cost Publications: Send request, enclosing remittance (check or money order), to the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402*

(*2*) *Free Publications: Request direct from the agency issuing them.*

From the Office of Education

Aids for Teaching Science: Suggestions for Starting Process Teaching in Science, by Ellsworth S. Obourn. April 1963. 15 p. Free. (OE–29044)

Cooperative Research Program: Application Instructions for Research Contracts. 1963. 36 p. Free. (OE–12017)

The Development of Education in Venezuela, by George L. Sanchez. 1963. 114 p. 55 cents. (OE–14086)

Eastern Europe, by Lois B. Watt and Dale F. Berger. June 26, 1963. 8 p. Free. (OE–14031–25)

Educational Data: The Sudan, by Abul H. K. Sassani. April 1963. 14 p. Free. (OE–14034–70)

Educational Research in Norway in the 20th Century, by Johs. Sandven. 1963. 31 p. 20 cents. (OE–14093)

Guidance for Children in Elementary Schools, by Hyrum M. Smith and Louise Omwake Eckerson. 1963. 22 p. 15 cents. (OE–25032)

Instructional Staff in Institutions of Higher Education Projected to 1970-71, by Kenneth A. Simon. 1963. 9 p. 10 cents. (OE–53018)

The Junior High School, 1959–60, by Grace S. Wright and Edith S. Greer. 1963. 96 p. 45 cents. (OE–20046)

Modern Mathematics and Your Child, by Harry L. Phillips and Marguerite Kluttz. 1963. 28 p. 20 cents. (OE–29047)

More Teachers for Business Education, by Bruce I. Blackstone. 1963. 4 p. Free. (OE–86008)

New Construction and Rehabilitation on College Campuses 1959–60 and 1960–61, by W. Robert Bokelman and Leslie F. Robbins. 1963. 54 p. 40 cents. (OE–51002–61)

Planning and Organizing an Export Trade Education Program, by Willem Winkel. 1963. 42 p. 20 cents. (OE–82012)

Preliminary Report on Offerings and Enrollments in Grades 9–12 of Nonpublic Secondary Schools, 1961–62, by Diane B. Gertler. 1963. 17 p. Free. (OE–24008)

Programs for the Educationally Disadvantaged. A report of a conference on teaching children and youth who are educationally disadvantaged. May 21–23, 1962. 1963. 105 p. 50 cents. (OE–35044)

Sources of Information on Educational Media, by John A. Moldstad. 1963. 29 p. 20 cents. (OE–34024)

Survey of State Legislation Relating to Higher Education, January 1, 1962 to December 31, 1962, by S. V. Martorana and Ernest V. Hollis. 1963. 135 p. $1.00. (OE–5008–62)

Teacher Turnover in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools 1959–60, by Frank Lindenfeld. 1963. 28 p. 25 cents. (OE–23002–60)

What Standards Do We Raise?, by Winslow R. Hatch. New Dimensions in Higher Education, No. 12. 1963. 28 p. 15 cents. (OE–53019)

From Other Government Agencies

Scientific Manpower 1962. Papers of the Eleventh Annual Conference on Scientific Manpower. National Science Foundation. 1963. 46 p. 35 cents. (NSF 63–31)

Two Years After the College Degree: Work and Further Study Patterns. Report on a 1960 survey of 1958 college graduates. National Science Foundation. 1963. 335 p. $1.75. (NSF 63–26)

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE:1963